

allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art.”
M.P.E.P. §2112.

With respect to claim 14, none of the references teach or suggest a mobile terminal that is incapable of displaying the graphical information in the second format (which can be displayed on the external display.) In particular, Reilly teaches conveying graphical information from the PCD to the remote display, but there is no teaching or suggestion that this graphical information is in a format that can not be displayed by the PCD. Moreover, in Tryding, the graphical information provided to the external display is in the same format as that provided to the mobile phone display.

With respect to claim 18, the Applicant is confused because the claim is rejected but also indicated as allowable. The Applicant submits that none of the references teach a means for dividing the screen of the display device into different portions that can be separately controlled.

For at least these additional reasons, these claims are patentable over the cited references. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of these claims.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: February 4, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By K. S. [Signature]

Bruce E. Black

Registration No.: 41,622

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 5257

New York, New York 10150-5257

(206) 262-8900

(212) 753-6237 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant